

09/772,231

MS155741.01/MSFTP186US

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-35 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bruno, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,604,123). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Bruno, *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations as recited in the subject claims.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claim 1 (and its dependent claims) recites *a system to facilitate substantially secure communication of data from a user-level process ... wherein communication between a first queue and a first communication context is controlled based on whether an appropriate association exists between the first queue and the first communication context, the association between the first queue and the first communication context being provided through a privileged operation not adjustable by the user-level process.* (Independent claims 14, 22, 23, 26, and 29 (and corresponding dependent claims) recite similar limitations). The association determines which queue may utilize which communication context. (*See e.g.*, pg. 7, lns. 3-4). If there is not a proper association, communication between the queue and communication context is prevented. (*See e.g., id.* at 15-17). The association isolates communication channels in different domains, for example, thereby enhancing integrity of the communication. (*See e.g.*, pg. 5, lns. 23-26). Bruno, *et al.* does not teach or suggest such novel features.

Bruno, *et al.* discloses transfer of control between computer system protection domains using portals. (*See e.g.*, col. 3, lns. 6-9). To accomplish this, a server 308, located at a user-level, registers with the system to allow the server 308 to be used by client applications. (*See*

09/772,231

MS155741.01/MSFTP186US

e.g., col. 7, lns. 20-22). The steps of registering the server are performed in the user-level with user-level processes, namely, server 308, portal manager 314, and name server 310. (See e.g., col. 6, ln. 57 – col. 7, ln. 9; and figures 3 and 4). The portal manager 314 *associates an identifier "I"* with a portal specification and returns the identifier to the server 308. (See e.g., col. 7, lns. 10-14). A specific portal defining the transfer of control is established through client application 312, name server 310, server 308, and portal manager 314. (See e.g., col. 7, lns. 23-33; and figures 3 and 5). Specifically, if access to the server 308 is approved name server 310 returns a server identification "I" to the client application 312. (See e.g., *id.*). The portal manager 314 creates portal code 316 in the nucleus by finding an available location (e) in a portal table 318 associated with the client application 312 and inserting a pointer to the portal code 316 at location (e) and returns (e) to the client application 312. (See e.g., *id.* at 36-44).

Thus, Bruno, *et al.* clearly discloses associating a first queue and a first communication context are adjusted by *user-level* operations. This is conceded by the Examiner in the Final Office Action "the server 308 defines a specific portal 318 for the client 312 to use..." and "portal manager 314 establishes the portal code locations 316 in the nucleus." (See e.g., pg. 15, lns. 3-4, 15-16; and pg. 16, lns. 5-6). However, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that the association of Bruno, *et al.* is privileged because a "queue" 318 is in the nucleus and a "communication context" 312 is in the user-level. (See e.g., pg. 15, lns. 6-10). It is noted that the association performed in Bruno, *et al.* is adjustable by a user-level process, namely the portal manager 314. The only operation performed in the privilege mode of Bruno, *et al.* is that the processor performs a lookup to portal table using as an index (e) and jumps to that location executing the portal code 316 that was created by the portal manager 314. (See e.g., col. 8, lns. 3-13).

Based on at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Bruno, *et al.* does not teach or suggest *the association between the first queue and the first communication context being provided through a privileged operation not adjustable by the user-level process* as recited in the subject claims. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

09/772,231

MS155741.01/MSFTP186US

CONCLUSION


The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP186US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP


Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731